

REMARKS

In summary, claims 1-39 are pending. The specification is objected to. Claims 6, 19, 27, and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112. Claims 22-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101. Claims 1-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102. By this response, the specification is amended, claims 22-26 and 28-33 are amended, and claims 6, 19, 27, and 39 are canceled. No new matter is added.

Objection To Specification

The specification is objected to because paragraph 0026 contains typographical errors. Paragraph 0026 is amended to correct the typographical errors. Accordingly, it is requested that the objection to the specification be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 6, 19, 27, and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Claims 6, 19, 27, and 39 are rejected because, as asserted in the instant Office Action, a trademark is used as a limitation to identify a product. Claims 6, 19, 27, and 39 are herein canceled. Accordingly, the rejection, under 35 U.S.C. §112, of claims 6, 19, 27, and 39, is moot.

Claim 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, because, as asserted in the instant Office Action, there is insufficient antecedent basis. Claim 30 is herein amended to alleviate the insufficient antecedent basis. Accordingly, it is requested that the rejection, under 35 U.S.C. §112, of claim 30 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §101

Claims 22-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101, because, as asserted in the instant Office Action, claims 22-33 may include a signal. Claims 22-26 and 28-33 are herein amended to recite “a computer readable storage medium.” Accordingly, it is requested that

the rejection, under 35 U.S.C. §101, of claims 22-26 and 28-33 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by an article entitled “Introduction to Series 60 Applications for C++ Developers,” Version 1.0, Nokia corporation, August 2002 (hereinafter referred to as “Series 60 for C++”).

Applicant’s claimed invention is directed to a technique for fast application debugging; thus providing a user of an application development tool the ability to quickly debug an application. To achieve fast debugging, specific functions related to debugging are performed in advance of the user invoking the debugger. Prior to launching the debugger: a hosting process, which creates an environment in which the application can be debugged, is started; a runtime environment is loaded in the hosting process; an application domain is created; and the debugger is attached to the hosting process. Thus, from the user’s perspective the time to start debugging is greatly reduced because many of the functions associated with starting the debugger have already been completed when the user invokes the debugger. An exemplary method for debugging an application operating within a hosted runtime environment in accordance with the present invention includes creating a hosting process not based on the application. The hosted runtime environment is created and loaded in a separate process (“hosting process”). The debugger is attached to the hosting process. Then, when a request to debug the application is received, the application is loaded into the hosting process, in response to receiving the request. Series 60 for C++ does not teach the above described technique for fast application debugging.

Series 60 for C++ neither discloses nor suggests several aspects of Applicant’s claimed invention. Series 60 for C++ neither discloses nor suggests fast application debugging as taught in Applicant’s claims. For example, Series 60 for C++ neither discloses nor suggests “starting said runtime environment in the hosting process,” as recited in claim 1. In the instant Office Action, it is asserted that this limitation is disclosed at page 6, section 2

of Series 60 for C++. The assertion is supported only by the statement “Series 60 Platform in the hosting process Symbian OS 6.1.” As understood by Applicant, Examiner equates the Series 60 Platform with the runtime environment and the Symbian OS 6.1 with the hosting process. Given this understanding, Series 60 for C++ does not teach “starting said runtime environment in the hosting process.” As taught on page 6, section 1.1 of Series 60 for C++, the Symbian OS 6.1 is “an open, robust, multitasking operating system designed for data-enabled mobile phones. And, as taught on page 6, section 2, of Series 60 for C++, the “Series 60 Platform is a complete smartphone reference design, including a host of wireless applications. The platform builds on the Symbian operating system (Symbian OS).” The OS 6.1 is part of the Series 60 Platform. Thus, it is not possible to start the Series 60 Platform in the Symbian OS 6.1.

Series 60 for C++ neither discloses nor suggest “attaching a debugger to said hosting process,” as recited in claim 1. In the instant Office Action, it is asserted that this limitation is disclosed at page 6, section 4 of Series 60 for C++. The assertion is supported only by the statement “Series 60 C++ Software Development Kit DSK, which provides tools to test and debug “Hello World” applications.” As described above, as Applicant understands, the hosting process is equated to the Symbian OS 6.1. Page 6, section 4, of Series 60 for C++ does not teach attaching a debugger to the Symbian OS 6.1. Further, Applicant could find no portion of Series 60 for C++ that teaches attaching a debugger to the Symbian OS 6.1.

Further, Applicant could find not portions of Series 60 for C++ that disclose or suggest “loading the application into the hosting process” “subsequent to said acts of creating, starting, and attaching,” as recited in claim 1.

The arguments provided above with respect to independent claim 1 also apply to independent claim 13, amended independent claim 22, and independent claim 34. Accordingly, it is requested that the rejection, under 35 U.S.C. §102, of claims 1-5, 7-18, 20-26, and 28-38, be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 1, 13, 22, and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,353,923, issued to Bogle *et al.* (hereinafter referred to as “Bogle *et al.*”).

Bogle *et al.* neither discloses nor suggests performing specific functions related to debugging in advance of invoking the debugger. Bogle *et al.* teaches an “active debugging environment for debugging a virtual application that contains program language code from multiple compiled and/or interpreted programming languages.” (Abstract). The first step of Bogle *et al.*’s debugging process is to activate the debugger, as illustrated in Figure 5 and column 12, lines 43-46: “The active debugging environment operational steps 500 begin at step 508 ...” Thus, active debugging is invoked at the beginning of the flow diagram of Figure 5 of Bogle *et al.*

Bogle *et al.* neither discloses nor suggests “creating a hosting process not based on said application,” as recited in claim 1. In fact, Bogle *et al.* discloses the exact opposite. At column 10, lines 25-28, Bogle *et al.* discloses “the first host process 220 contains the application 421 that is the debugging target ...” (Emphasis added).

The arguments provided above with respect to independent claim 1 also apply to independent claim 13, amended independent claim 22, and independent claim 34. Because Bogle *et al.* neither discloses nor suggests performing specific functions related to debugging in advance of invoking the debugger, and because Bogle *et al.* neither discloses nor suggests “creating a hosting process not based on said application,” it is requested that the rejection, under 35 U.S.C. §102, of claims 1, 13, 22, and 34, be reconsidered and withdrawn.

DOCKET NO.: MSFT-1757
Application No.: 10/626,958
Office Action Dated: November 1, 2006

PATENT

CONCLUSION

It is requested that the forgoing amendments, arguments, and remarks be entered, and in view thereof, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of this application and an early Notice of Allowance are respectfully requested. In the event that the Examiner cannot allow this application for any reason, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney to discuss resolution of any remaining issues.

Date: February 1, 2007

/Joseph F. Oriti/
Joseph F. Oriti
Registration No. 47,835

Woodcock Washburn LLP
One Liberty Place - 46th Floor
Philadelphia PA 19103
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439